

REMARKS

After the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-28, as amended, are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6-11, 13 and 19-24 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the application by the Amendment.

Examiner's Note

The Examiner stated that the preferred format of the claims is to number each line of each claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. Applicant has reviewed both 37 C.F.R. and the MPEP of latest issue and was unable to find any statement that the numbering of the lines of claims in the manner set forth by the Examiner is preferred. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out where in 37 C.F.R. or in the MPEP such preference is stated.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 4, 19 and 20 to correct the antecedent bases in claims 4 and 9. Applicant has also clarified claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejection of claims 4, 19 and 20.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-14 and 16-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,690,480 (Maeda) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,589 (Jefferson). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Maeda is directed to a one-touch Internet FAX apparatus which, upon receiving an Internet address from a certain destination, the apparatus is able to communicate with the

same destination either by telephone, or over the Internet. A random access memory in the FAX apparatus, stores in a single table (Fig. 3), a list of one-touch numbers, each of which is uniquely associated with another image communication apparatus. Also, associated with each one-touch number in the table is a telephone number of another communication apparatus, the presence or absence of a G3 FAX function, the presence or absence of an Internet FAX function, an Internet address and an abbreviation uniquely identifying the another image communication apparatus (Fig. 3 and col. 10, lines 26-33). The decision as to whether to transmit to another communication apparatus by way of a telephone line or by way of the Internet is determined by the presence or absence of the table entries shown in Fig. 3. According to Fig. 4, if both a telephone function and an Internet function are present, the FAX is transmitted over the Internet.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image communication apparatus which comprises a first network address supplying device storing a plurality of telephone numbers associated with a first telephone network and providing a network address corresponding to each of the telephone numbers and a second network address supplying device storing a plurality of telephone numbers associated with a second telephone network and providing a network address corresponding to each one of the second telephone numbers, a judging section which determines whether a telephone number input to the apparatus corresponds to the first telephone network or to the second telephone network and a transmitting section which routes the input telephone number to either the first address supplying device or the second address supplying device based on an output of the judging section.

The Examiner first states that Maeda teaches first and second address supplying devices by reference to col. 18, lines 15-37 and Fig. 3. Col. 18, lines 15-37 describes a protocol for switching a transmitting device from a G3 mode to an Internet FAX mode in which, in response to a communication received from the transmitting device, a network address of a receiving apparatus is transmitted from the receiving device to the transmitting device and in response thereto, the transmitting device switches to the Internet FAX mode and uses the

supplied network address to communicate with the receiving device. Accordingly, Maeda discloses a device which has only a single telephone number and a single network address and does not teach or suggest an address supplying device being able to store a plurality of telephone numbers and corresponding network addresses, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, the table in Fig. 3, while disclosing a plurality of telephone numbers and network addresses, does not teach, suggest or disclose that the telephone numbers are associated with only a single telephone network, as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner further states that while Maeda does not teach a first telephone number corresponding to a first network and a second telephone number corresponding to a second network or a judging section which judges whether an input telephone number corresponds to a first telephone number or a second telephone number, Jefferson teaches fax image transmission through a fax card and the system disclosed by Jefferson would identify the corresponding network the telephone number belongs to.

Jefferson discloses a system which compares a telephone number input by a user to a plurality of templates. An inputted telephone number conforming to one of the templates is modified in accordance with fixed rules to delete unnecessary portions of the inputted telephone number and to add other portions. In the example cited by the Examiner at col. 5, line 45 to col. 6, line 30, the system disclosed by Jefferson recognizes that the area code in the inputted telephone number is a local call and therefore deletes the area code digits and substitutes the digit "9" corresponding to a local call.

Applicant submits that Jefferson does not teach a judging section that judges whether a telephone number belongs to a first telephone network or a second telephone network. and provides that decision to a number transmitting section for routing a telephone number to a first destination or a second destination as recited in amended claim 1. Jefferson merely analyzes a telephone number to determine if there are redundant digits in the telephone number as input and removes the redundant digits, or determines if certain digits are missing, as for example a missing "1" in front of a long distance call, and adds the "1" if found missing. Accordingly,

there is no teaching or suggestion in Jefferson that a telephone number is examined for the purpose of determining whether it belongs to one network or another.

Applicant submits that Jefferson and Maeda are not properly combinable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. There is no teaching or suggestion in Maeda to incorporate a judging section which judges whether an input telephone number belongs to a first telephone network or a second telephone network. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in Jefferson to apply the disclosed telephone number modification for determining whether an input telephone number belongs to a first telephone network or a second telephone network.

Applicant further submits that the system disclosed by Jefferson does not make up for the deficiencies of Maeda. There is no teaching or suggestion in Jefferson of first and second address supplying devices, each of which includes a plurality of telephone numbers belonging to a single telephone network, as recited in claim 1 and which is not taught or suggested by Maeda. Accordingly, even if Maeda and Jefferson were combined, the combination would not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended claim 1. Applicant submits that the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not make amended claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 1.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 1 has been shown to be allowable, claims 2 and 4-12, dependent on claim 1 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 2 and 4-12.

Claim 13

Amended claim 13 recites, *inter alia*, a first telephone network operative with a first telephone number, a second telephone network operative with a second telephone number, a first address supplying device connected to said computer network being able to store a plurality of first telephone numbers and supply a network address corresponding to each one of the first telephone numbers and a second address supplying device connected to said computer network being able to store a plurality of second telephone numbers and supply a network address

corresponding to each one of the second telephone numbers. As discussed above, the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not teach or suggest first and second address supplying devices, each of which includes a plurality of telephone numbers belonging to a single telephone network. Applicant submits that the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not make amended claim 13 obvious. Accordingly, for the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 13.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 13 has been shown to be allowable, claims 14 and 16-18, dependent on claim 13 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 14 and 16-18:

Claim 19

Amended claim 19 recites, *inter alia*, an image communication method for carrying out image communication with another image communication apparatus, based on a network address, through a computer network, comprising attempting to acquire the network address corresponding to said telephone number, when said telephone number is judged to correspond to the first telephone network by referring to a first table having a plurality of telephone numbers associated with only said first telephone network and attempting to acquire the network address corresponding to said telephone number, when said telephone number is judged to correspond to the second telephone network by referring to a second table having a plurality of telephone numbers associated with only said second telephone network; and if the network address is acquired, transmitting said image to said another communication apparatus based on said acquired network address.

As discussed above, the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not teach or suggest first and second address supplying devices, each of which includes a plurality of telephone numbers belonging to a single telephone network as recited in amended claim 19.

Further, the Examiner has failed to identify where the combination of Maeda and Jefferson teaches or suggests attempting to acquire the network address by referring to a first

table having telephone numbers of only a first network and to a second table having telephone numbers of only a second telephone network.

Applicant submits that the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not make amended claim 19 obvious. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 19.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 19 has been shown to be allowable, claims 20-23, dependent on claim 19 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 20-23.

Claim 24

Amended claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, an image communication system comprising: a first address supplying device used in outside communication having a plurality of telephone numbers associated with only outside communications; and a second address supplying device used in inside communication having a plurality of telephone numbers associated with only said inside communications. As discussed above, the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not teach or suggest first and second address supplying devices, each of which includes a plurality of telephone numbers belonging to a single telephone network as recited in amended claim 24. Further, The combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not teach or suggest that the two recited telephone networks are inside and outside networks.

Applicant submits that the combination of Maeda and Jefferson does not make amended claim 24 obvious. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 24.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that since claim 24 has been shown to be allowable, claims 25-28, dependent on claim 24 are allowable, at least by their dependency. Accordingly, for all the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 25-28.

Application No. 09/875,075
Reply to Office Action of June 17, 2005

CONCLUSION

Insofar as the Examiner's rejections have been addressed, the application is in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowability of claims 1-2, 4-14, and 16-28 is therefore earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner choose to issue an advisory action, Applicant respectfully requests that prior thereto, the Examiner telephone the undersigned at the telephone number indicated to discuss the application.

Respectfully submitted,

HIROSHI ENDO

Nov. 15, 2005
(Date)

By:


LOUIS SICKLES II

Registration No. 45,803

AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP

One Commerce Square

2005 Market Street, Suite 2200

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013

Telephone: 215-965-1200

Direct Dial: 215-965-1294

Facsimile: 215-965-1210

E-Mail: lsickles@akingump.com

LS